



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,160	12/04/2003	Puthukode G. Ramachandran	AUS920030976US1	6788
35525	7590	10/10/2008	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 802333			2175	
DALLAS, TX 75380				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/728,160	RAMACHANDRAN, PUTHUKODE G.
	Examiner Stephen Alvesteffer	Art Unit 2175

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit: 2175

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant remarks have been considered by the examiner, but are not persuasive.

Applicants assert that "an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows" is shown in the drawings. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As best understood by the examiner in light of the reply dated 3/25/08, applicant argues that "a list of currently active browser windows" is displayed separately from "an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows". It is apparent in Figure 4B that "an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows" is the same as "a list of currently active browser windows". They are not separately displayed.

Applicants assert that "a new document is to be displayed, a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document" is adequately described in the original disclosure. The examiner respectfully disagrees. While "a list of browser windows" was filed in the original disclosure, examiner cannot find "a list of currently active browser windows" in the original disclosure being used in a manner consistent with the recited claims.

Applicants assert that the 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1-20 is improper. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The limitation of "a new document is to be displayed, a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document" is confusing. As applicants point out, selecting the "new" option is not the input that opens new documents. The input that opens new documents is a right mouse click (in one embodiment). This is confusing, but is now understood. However, the claim language is still confusing because it recites displaying "a list of currently active browser windows". As defined in the instant specification paragraph [0033], "Active browser window is the window that was last used for viewing a Web page". As best understood in light of the specification, there can only be one active browser window at any given point in time. Therefore, it is still unclear as to what kind of list is displayed when the input is received.

Applicants assert that Busic does not teach "replacing, in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows, a document displayed in the browser window with the new document". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that the claims must be interpreted with the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. In this case, copying a selected URL to the user's list window can be interpreted as replacing the user's list window with an updated displayed document.

Regarding claim 21, applicants assert that Sylor does not disclose "a list of browser windows is displayed including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 21 recites that a "list of browser windows" is displayed, and that list includes "a presently displayed document". Looking at item 426 of Figure 4B, list of "browser windows" and the "presently displayed document" appear to be the same thing. They both appear to be directed to the name of the document, which is disclosed by Sylor.